

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-23 are pending in the application, and that claims 19-22 have been withdrawn. The Examiner rejected claims 1-18 and 23. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 7, 16, and 23 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §112**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner stated that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention. The Examiner stated that "the recited line feeding mode set forth in independent claim 1 is not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention."

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-18 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. The Examiner put forth particular features of claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 16, and 23 that have "omitted structural cooperative relationships."

By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 7, 16, and 23 have been amended to more accurately recite the features of the present invention. Regarding claim 5, the Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claims 1 and 4 should overcome the Examiner's §112 rejections of that claim. Regarding claim 8, the Applicant respectfully submits that the line feeding mode that the Examiner has characterized as unclear is the line feeding mode introduced in claim 1, and which is named as such throughout the claims. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Examiner's §112 rejections of claims 1-18 and 23.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102**

In item pages 4-7 the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4, 16-17, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,085,420, issued to Sata (hereinafter referred to as "Sata"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of these claims.

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites “a drive roller power transmitter disposed to transmit a driving force between the first drive roller and the second drive roller and between the first drive roller and the pickup roller and thereby transmitting a driving force to the first and second drive rollers and the pickup roller during a paper pickup mode, and transmitting the driving force only to the first and second drive rollers during a line feeding mode.” The Applicant respectfully submits that Sata does not disclose at least these features of claim 1 of the present application.

Sata describes separating rollers 46 which rotate in a clockwise direction through gears 23, 25, 26, 19, a rotary shaft 10, a spring clutch 53, and gears 52, 51, 50, 49 when a motor 21 is rotated in a reverse direction (corresponding to the conveyance of the sheet of paper in the present invention) to rotate the conveying roller 64, and that the feed rollers 5 are rotated in the counter-clockwise direction by following the movement of the original without receiving the driving force by the action of the clutch 29 (Column 5, Lines 10-14, and Column 6, lines 36-40). The gear 25 transmits the driving force to the separating rollers 46 which correspond to the second drive roller of the present invention, but does not transmit the driving force to the feed rollers 5, which correspond to the first drive roller of the present invention. Thus, at least the drive roller power transmitter of claim 1 of the present application is not disclosed in Sata.

Therefore, Sata does not disclose at least the feature of “a drive roller power transmitter disposed to transmit a driving force between the first drive roller and the second drive roller and between the first drive roller and the pickup roller and thereby transmitting a driving force to the first and second drive rollers and the pickup roller during a paper pickup mode, and transmitting the driving force only to the first and second drive rollers during a line feeding mode.” Accordingly, Sata does not disclose every element of the Applicant's claim 1. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim (MPEP §2131). Therefore, since Sata does not disclose the features recited in independent claim 1, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Sata, and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Claims 2, 4, and 16-17 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not taught or suggested by Sata. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 4, and 16-17 also patentably distinguish over Sata.

Claim 23 of the present application, as amended, recites “a swing gear part disposed to engage with the feed roller part and to transmit a driving force from the feed roller part to one of the first drive roller or the second drive roller according to a rotational direction of the feed roller

part; and....wherein the feed roller part rotates in the first rotational direction during the pickup mode, and rotates in a second rotational direction opposite the first rotational direction during the line feeding mode.” The spring clutch 28 discussed by the Examiner transmits the driving force to the separating rollers 46 which correspond to the second drive roller of the present invention, when the motor 21 is rotated in the normal direction, but does not transmit the driving force of the feed rollers 5 which correspond to the first drive roller of the present invention when the motor 21 is rotated in the reverse direction. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 23 also patentably distinguishes over Sata.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

In item 5 on pages 7-8 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sata in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,024,356, issued to Tanaka et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Tanaka”). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejections of these claims.

As discussed in the preceding section of this Amendment, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Sata. Further, the deficiencies of Sata in regard to claim 1 are not cured by Tanaka. As claims 11-12 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not taught or suggested by the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that claims 11-12 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

#### Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 4, 7, 16, and 23 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Claims 1-23 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Serial No. 10/791,757

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 01/23/06

By: Thomas L. Jones  
Thomas L. Jones  
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501